

# **EXHIBIT K**

**From:** [vsvconsult](#)  
**To:** [Keech, Ryan Q.](#)  
**Cc:** [Makitalo, Rebecca I.](#); [Chiu, Stacey G.](#); [Winningham, Jacob R.](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Subpoena Objection re: Vasana Varadarajan. In re Arjun Vasana v. Checkmate.com, Inc. - Case No.: 2:25-cv-00765-MEMF-JPR [KLG-AMERICAS.FID3718879]  
**Date:** Friday, September 19, 2025 2:18:18 PM

---

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

Dear Counsel,

It appears that you have not read my email in its entirety. I have family obligations and health constraints, and will be available only after Mid November, and any deposition must only be remote and time limited and pertaining only in reference to the business transaction as outlined in the case. I have to be home in Cerritos to look after an elderly relative. Sometime after Mid November, I will be available remotely as indicated for the subpoena purposes.

I also need time to consider and avail of legal representation if that is necessary.

Please note the other contents of your email are speculative and unsubstantiated and my reply here is only to my availability. Nothing I wrote contradicts anything declared in the New York Action (I have not submitted any testimony in California). My statements regarded my peripheral knowledge of the transaction, my son's physical presence in California, and that I had no claims on any code at issue--all of which you had disputed.

By contrast, your subpoena purports to seek documents well outside my testimony, and is facially overbroad--and would sweep in private family communications, health matters and privileged materials that have nothing to do with this case.

- Vasana Varadarajan

On Wed, Sep 17, 2025 at 10:16 PM Keech, Ryan Q. <[Ryan.Keech@klgates.com](mailto:Ryan.Keech@klgates.com)> wrote:  
Mr. Varadarajan,

As it happens, this email contradicts sworn testimony already provided by you regarding your involvement with your son's claims and defenses. Even were it not the case that you were a relevant witness - which you are - the law does not permit you to simultaneously insert yourself as a witness and avoid discovery in this case.

Our client is willing to accommodate legitimate scheduling conflicts and discuss the parameters of your production, but a subpoena is an order of the court with which you are required to comply. We invite you to seek competent legal advice to address these obligations. My colleagues will be in touch to confirm scheduling for your deposition and production of documents and communications.

Best regards,

**Ryan Q. Keech**

Partner

K&L Gates LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 8th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90067

Phone: 310.552.5070

Mobile: 646.510.3630

[ryan.keech@klgates.com](mailto:ryan.keech@klgates.com)

[www.klgates.com](http://www.klgates.com)

---

**From:** vsvconsult <[vsvconsult@gmail.com](mailto:vsvconsult@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Saturday, September 13, 2025 7:19 PM

**To:** Makitalo, Rebecca I. <[Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com](mailto:Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com)>

**Cc:** Keech, Ryan Q. <[Ryan.Keech@klgates.com](mailto:Ryan.Keech@klgates.com)>; Chiu, Stacey G.

<[Stacey.Chiu@klgates.com](mailto:Stacey.Chiu@klgates.com)>; Winningham, Jacob R. <[Jacob.Winningham@klgates.com](mailto:Jacob.Winningham@klgates.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Subpoena Objection re: Vasana Varadarajan. In re Arjun Vasana v.

Checkmate.com, Inc. - Case No.: 2:25-cv-00765-MEMF-JPR [KLG-AMERICAS.FID3718879]

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender. Dear Counsel,

It is an onerous burden on me to be subpoenaed in this case. This is in consideration that I have no relevant relationship to Voicebite or checkmate. I had retired much before that and was only peripherally aware of Voicebite formation, and its transactions with Checkmate. At this stage in my 70<sup>th</sup> year, I am occupied in my personal matters and would have difficulty traveling for an in person deposition due to health reasons.

Further, I note that Checkmate named me as a third party with potential claims in its counterclaims. I have already declared that I have no such claims. That is the extent of my relationship with VoiceBite.

I had stated my objections to the subpoena to you and these are again attached to this email.

I also became aware that the Plaintiff's (Arjun Vasana) motion to dismiss your counterclaims was not opposed by you in a timely manner. I believe that your subpoena to me is in relation to the counterclaims.

I request that my Sept 22 deposition be continued to (at minimum) 21 days after the Court rules on Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss Counterclaims and that any deposition proceed remotely under Rule 30(b)(4) from my city. I timely served Rule 45(d)(2)(B) objections to the document requests; no production will occur absent court order.

Your Rule 45(a)(4) party notice was served after you served me.

Please confirm your acceptance to the request by Monday 15<sup>th</sup> Sept 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time

or I will seek a stay and move ex parte under Rules 26(c) and 45(d)(3).

Sincerely,

Vasan Varadarajan

On Fri, Sep 12, 2025 at 2:21 PM Makitalo, Rebecca I. <[Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com](mailto:Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com)> wrote:

Mr. Varadarajan,

I write to follow up for a second time on my initial request, dated August 29, 2025, to meet and confer regarding your objections to Checkmate's subpoena. Please provide your availability for a meeting on either September 16 or 17, 2025. If you have retained legal counsel, please forward their contact information to me so that we can coordinate accordingly.

Thank you,

**Rebecca Makitalo**

Associate

K&L Gates LLP  
10100 Santa Monica Blvd

8th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Phone: 310 552-5502

Cell: 818 251-6956

[rebecca.makitalo@klgates.com](mailto:rebecca.makitalo@klgates.com)

[www.klgates.com](http://www.klgates.com)

---

**From:** Winningham, Jacob R. <[Jacob.Winningham@klgates.com](mailto:Jacob.Winningham@klgates.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, September 4, 2025 1:59 PM

**To:** [vsvconsult@gmail.com](mailto:vsvconsult@gmail.com)

**Cc:** Keech, Ryan Q. <[Ryan.Keech@klgates.com](mailto:Ryan.Keech@klgates.com)>; Makitalo, Rebecca I.  
<[Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com](mailto:Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com)>; Chiu, Stacey G. <[Stacey.Chiu@klgates.com](mailto:Stacey.Chiu@klgates.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Subpoena Objection re: Vasana Varadarajan. In re Arjun Vasana v. Checkmate.com,  
Inc. - Case No.: 2:25-cv-00765-MEMF-JPR

Mr. Varadarajan,

I hope that this message finds you well. I am writing to follow up on last week's correspondence between my colleague Ms. Makitalo and yourself. We are in receipt of your subpoena objections. We would like to meet and confer regarding Checkmate's subpoena and the basis for your objections. If you have retained legal representation, please give us the contact information for your counsel and we can speak with them directly.

Please let us know your availability for a telephonic or virtual meet-and-confer after 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 9 and Wednesday, September 10. Thank you.

Best,

Jake Winningham



**Jacob Winningham**

Associate

K&L Gates LLP  
10100 Santa Monica Blvd

8<sup>th</sup> Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Phone: 310 552-5042

[jacob.winningham@klgates.com](mailto:jacob.winningham@klgates.com)

[www.klgates.com](http://www.klgates.com)

This electronic message contains information from the law firm of K&L Gates LLP. The contents may be privileged and confidential and are intended for the use of the intended addressee(s) only. If you are not an intended addressee, note that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact me at [Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com](mailto:Rebecca.Makitalo@klgates.com).